REMARKS

Claims 7-9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 7 is amended for clarity and to correct informalities. Claims 10-12 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter that these claims recite. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim objections

Claim 7 was objected to in the Office Action. Claim 7 is amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 7 is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was objected to in the Office Action. The cancellation of claim 11 renders this objection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The cancellation of claims 11 and 12 renders this objection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

The cancellation of claims 11 and 12 renders this objection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being drawn to non-

statutory subject matter. Claim 7 is amended to obviate this rejection.

Claim 7 recites, in particular, automatically creating in the requirements management tool a navigation module including all the UML objects pointed at by at least one requirement and a requirements module of level based on the exported requirements. Thus, claim 7 recites transforming the exported requirements transformed into a navigation module.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §101 are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0125769 to McGovern et al. (hereinafter "McGovern") in view of Requirements Based UML by Schulz. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It was conceded in the Office Action that McGovern does not teach the model is a UML tool. It was asserted in the Office Action that Schulz remedies these shortfalls of McGovern.

The analysis of the Office Action fails for the following reason.

Claim 7 recites, among other features, exporting the requirements entered into the UML model to a requirements management tool.

The Office Action asserts that McGovern teaches these features at paragraph [0034]. McGovern teaches at paragraph [0034] use cases are stored in an asset repository according to a meta model which allows retrieval of use cases for re-use. McGovern would not have suggested exporting the requirements entered into the UML model to a requirements management tool because a repository cannot reasonably be considered to correspond to a requirements management tool.

Schulz, as applied to claim 1, does not remedy these shortfalls of McGovern because Schulz teaches on page 312 third paragraph that once Business Requirement are defined they can be used as a basis for developing the Use Case diagrams. Thus,

Schulz teaches defining the requirements before the UML model. Schulz would not have suggested exporting the Business Requirements. Further, claim 7 recites, among other features, creating requirements during the creation of the elements of the UML model. As noted above, Schulz teaches defining the requirements before the UML model. Thus, Schulz would not have suggested creating requirements during the creation of the elements of the UML model, as recited in claim 7.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of McGovern with Schulz cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combination of all of the features recited in claim 7. Further, the combination of McGovern with Schulz cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 8 and 9 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGovern in view of Schulz are respectfully requested.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McGovern in view of Schulz further in view of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art.

The cancellation of claim 10 renders this rejection moot.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McGovern in view of Schulz in view of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,795 to Nakamura.

The cancellation of claim 11 renders this rejection moot.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McGovern in view of Schulz in view of Applicants' alleged admitted prior art in view of Traceability in an integrated Development Environment by Macfarlane et al. (hereinafter "Macfarlane").

The cancellation of claim 12 renders this rejection moot.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

Kenneth M. Berner

Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: February 3, 2011
KMB/MIL/TC/bjs